

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

CHARLESTON DIVISION

JORDAN LAWRENCE RAUCH,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:15-cv-15637

JAMES RUBENSTEIN, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

This action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of proposed findings of fact and recommendations for disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On July 12, 2016, Judge Tinsley submitted his Proposed Findings and Recommendations [ECF No. 8] (“PF&R”). The PF&R recommends the court **DENY** the plaintiff’s Letter-Form Request for Judgment by Default [ECF No. 6]. No party filed objections—timely or otherwise—to the PF&R.

A district court “shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). This court is not, however, required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985).

Because the parties have not filed objections, the court **ACCEPTS** and **INCORPORATES** herein the PF&R and orders judgment consistent therewith. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** the Petitioner's Letter-Form Request for Judgment by Default [ECF No. 6].

The court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: August 9, 2016



JOSEPH R. GOODWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE